

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar (U.S. 6,018,627) in view of Talatik (U.S. 5,873,094). Applicants disagree.

Regarding the last clause of claim 1, the step of disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said dissemination structure, Iyengar does not describe or suggest this. What claim 1 requires to be disseminated is the business control data that was entered into the common database in the previous step of claim 1. Furthermore this last clause of claim 1 requires that respective portions of this business control data be disseminated to a plurality of applications according to the dissemination structure in the model of business rules developed in the first clause of claim 1.

The Examiner cites Iyengar, col. 3, lines 1-2, col. 12, lines 35-51. Col. 3, lines 1-2 merely states that applications are deployed. In col. 12, lines 30-34 Iyengar states that deployment takes built applications and installs them. Then in cited col. 12, lines 35-51 Iyengar further describes this deployment of applications including wrapping various components of the applications as packages and then deploying the packaged components. Iyengar is clearly deploying applications, not disseminating business control data as required by claim 1.

The Examiner states that the last clause of claim 1, e.g., disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said dissemination structure is a well-known technique in the art and cites Talatik as an example. Applicants respectfully traverse this general assertion and specifically disagree that Talatik describes this requirement of claim 1.

Talatik describes an information model 12 having a set of objects. His invention allows end users to create applications directly from the information model (also referred to as a business model) without having to write the source code for the application.

Talatik has a control system engine 14 to activate an object from the set of objects in the information model (col. 3, lines 25-27). The control system engine also activates "instants" of the object. An "instant" of an object refers to a given condition or state of the values of the object's attributes (col. 3, lines 34-36).

The information model may have an instant propagation type flag indicating how to propagate the change of instant for a primitive or atomic object of the instant (col. 4, lines 57-59).

Talatik does not describe disseminating respective portions of business control data to a plurality of applications. Talatik describes propagating a change of instant for an object of the instant. Therefore, Talatik does not describe this important requirement of Applicants' claim 1.

Neither Iyengar nor Talatik nor the combination describes all of the steps of Applicants' claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. All of the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly on allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 09/10/2008

By: /John Pivnichny/

John R. Pivnichny

Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358

Fax: (607) 429-4119